DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 045 HE 010 169

AUTHOR Eakin, Frank E., Jr.
TITLE A Buberian Approach to Faculty Development.
INSTITUTION American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. Academic Administration Internship Program.; Richmond Univ., Va.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 28p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Educational Theories; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Human Relations; Individualism; Professional Recognition; *Self Esteem
IDENTIFIERS *Buber (Martin)

ABSTRACT

Martin Buber's themes are applied to faculty development, particularly his insistence upon the primacy of the individual while always looking to the "other." It is concluded that Buber helps persons to recognize that teaching and personal fulfillment build on relationships rather than on abstract, objectified experiences. It is felt that Buber stands to remind us that a program of faculty development must affirm the individual as a person and confirm his self-esteem, must be dialogic by nature, and must represent the institution's encompassing commitment to individual fulfillment. (Author/SPG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED156045

A Buberian Approach to Faculty Development

By

Frank E. Eakin, Jr.
University of Richmond

For

Academic Administration Internship Program

American Council on Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frank E. Eakin Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

April 1976

HE 010 169

A Buberian Approach to Faculty Development

Frank E. Eakin, Jr.
University of Richmond

Introduction

Surveying the topics chosen by most American Council on Education Academic Administration Internship Program Fellows for annual papers, there has existed an apparent preference for result-oriented, practical papers. These studies have characteristically probed problems to discover processes whereby desired results may be assured -- in committee functioning, tenure determination, communication effectiveness, or a myriad of other subjects.

Obviously such studies make significant contributions. My own interest, however, focuses where delineation of presuppositions must precede discussion of process. This paper addresses some of the presuppositions which should undergird a faculty development program. To focus upon presuppositions necessarily moves this paper toward a more abstract orientation, and, while the paper does not delineate how to establish a faculty development program in a given situation,[1] some of the preliminary concerns necessary for an effective program are addressed.

From personal perspective, a major problem for faculty development programs rests in the failure to develop a type of metaphysic governing the basic nature and focus of the programs. Apart from such presuppositional base, a program frequently flounders in trial and error, often changes focus, and, more importantly, fails to maintain proper perspective on its most fundamental characteristic, the humaneness which must characterize human

relationships. Whatever else a faculty development program might be, it is necessarily a meeting of human with human, a place where individual aspirations, ambitions, and potentialities find room for expression.

In The College Classroom: Conflict, Changes, and Learning, it is stated:

> If you were to interrupt a college teacher and ask him what is going on in his class, his answer would probably focus on the material being covered at that moment. The content of the lecture or discussion would be central to his awareness of what was happening. But if you pressed him a bit and asked if that were really all that was going on, he would probably be able to identify other events: two students whispering, one looking especially pleased at the political implications of the teacher's last comments, some misgivings on the teacher's part about whether he had represented the facts correctly and so on.[2]

While this is probably an accurate assessment of most traditional classrooms, my primary interest is the way the instructor has reacted to every element of his situation as if it were object. People, facts, interpretation -- all are objectified. Unfortunately, many instructors lack a sensitive relationship with colleagues, students, and disciplines. At this point Martin Buber speaks to us, both to colleague-student-discipline relationships and to the related phenomenon of faculty development.

For those unfamiliar with the amazingly productive Jewish scholar, Martin Buber,[3] the paper's title may appear a strange juxtaposition of words. Acquaintance with the writings of Israel's late sage, however, reveals that few fields of academic inquiry are beyond Buber's influence. His thought has influenced especially the disciplines of education, sociology, philosophy, psychology, and religion. My contention is that Buber's thought also contributes to the discussion of faculty development, one of the more pressing issues in higher education today.

I do not claim Martin Buber to be the enlightening factor for genre faculty development. The thought of numerous individuals in diverse disciplines could be applied to faculty development. It does seem, however, that Buber's anthropological views, particularly his I-Thou perspective as expressed in his relational philosophy, apply to faculty development in a rather unique fashion. A Buberian approach provides a solid presuppositional foundation for the enterprise of faculty development.

Martin Buber

(February 2, 1878 - June 13, 1965)[4]

Born in Vienna, Martin Buber's parents divorced when he was three. Until he was fourteen, he lived with his grandparents, at which time he rejoined his father, now remarried. Buber's grandfather, Salomon Buber, was an authority on midrashic and medieval rabbinic literature. His grandmother, Adele Buber, managed the family's business ventures, thereby freeing Salomon for his scholarly activities. At the same time, she was a loving, caring woman. Streiker states:

> The kindness and love which she lavished on the motherless boy taught him the meaning of human concern just as his grandfather's example produced a reverence for the collective memory of the Jewish people and a passion for transmitting it to successive generations. Without Salomon and Adele Buber, the remarkable potentiality of this child might never have been actualized.[5]

Buber's adult life bore the imprint of Salomon and Adele Buber's influence.

Another childhood factor to emerge later in significant fashion was his observation of several hasidic communities near his grandparents' home. One of Buber's primary contributions was his role in making available hasidic literature and lore through his translations of and commentaries on hasidic texts.

Buber enrolled at the University of Vienna in 1896, pursuing additional studies at the universities of Leipzig, Berlin, and Zurich. Typical of many European Jews, during this period Buber was not overly denying his Jewishness but at the same time he was not concerned to affirm his Jewish roots.

In 1901 Buber was significantly influenced by the political Zionist movement led by Theodor Herzl. Buber ultimately did not find the nationalism characteristic of Zionism to be satisfactory, however, nor did the leadership exercised by Herzl respond to his questions regarding the nature and destiny of Judaism.

As a result of these unanswered questions Buber withdrew for a period of five years (1904-1909) for personal evaluation and examination. During these years he studied the ḥasidic movement, attempting to understand the sense of joy and personal relationship which characterized the ḥasidim.

From 1916 to 1924 Buber edited Der Jude, a German journal dedicated to the spiritual and cultural aspects of political Zionism. In 1925, his academic career was launched with his appointment to a professorship at Frankfort University. He was relieved of this post in 1933 when the Nazis gained control of Germany.

In the face of mounting anti-Semitism, Buber remained in Germany from 1933 to 1938, seeking to encourage faithfulness to Judaism by fellow Jews. Ultimately, in 1938, he emigrated to Jerusalem, where he joined the faculty of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. He taught actively until 1951, when he retired. In 1965, Buber died at the age of eighty-seven years.

Buber's prime concerns were anthropology and epistomology, or, as suggested by one of his most able interpreters, philosophical anthropology.[6] He focused on persons, particularly their relational aspects. This anthropological thrust was epistomological in that Buber desired to understand

how an individual achieves experiential knowledge, both of self and of his fellow. He expressed his thought most effectively in his classic book I and Thou.[7]

There were a number of factors which contributed to the development of Buber's relational philosophy. A major influence has been associated with a particular student who visited him during the late autumn of 1914. Having spent the morning in mystical, contemplative ecstasy, Buber was visited during the afternoon by the young man. The student was obviously deeply troubled; and, while they had a friendly conversation, Buber realized in retrospect that he failed the yourg man, more in the questions he failed to ask than in those he asked. Buber learned later from the yourg man's friends, the student was no longer alive, just how distressed the young man was, that he had approached Buber "not for a chat but a decision."[8] Buber, however, had been so taken with his own experience of the morning that the cry of his guest was unheard. Grete Schaeder, commenting on this incident, notes that as a result of this encounter Buber determined that "all timelessness that is acquired by sacrificing the moment (is) too dearly bought."[9]

A second factor influencing Buber's relational philosophy was the tragic war Europe experienced during the second decade of the twentieth century. During these years Buber was writing I and Thou, with the first draft being completed in 1916. I and Thou was his attempt to express the impact of his personal transforming faith experience.[10] It is little wonder that critics have been uncertain how to categorize I and Thou -- philosophy, theology, or indeed as poetry.

While I and Thou is perhaps the best expression of Buber's relational view, Between Man and Man is a helpful tool for clarifying Buber's views. In the latter Buber described man as being unique in that he participates both

in finitude and infinity. He asserted that "Man is the crystallized potentiality of existence."[11] In referring to man's potentiality, Buber was primarily seeking to emphasize the wholeness of man.

Buber suggested that authentic life is possible only in the present; and he was keenly aware of the power of the contemporary moment, the "Here and Now" of the moment never to be repeated.[12] Such authentic life is relational, with three possibilities for such relationship existing: life with nature, with other men, and with spiritual beings.[13] Buber's primary relational concern, however, was with men. Even antithetical positions do not preclude relational possibilities. As Buber asserted, the individual "even when he stands in opposition to the other, heeds, affirms, and confirms his opponent as an existing other."[14]

In a dialogue with psychologist Carl R. Rogers, Buber made explicit an intended distinction between acceptance, or affirmation, and confirmation of an individual. Maurice Friedman has grasped Buber's distinction when he stated:

> Rogers emphasizes an unqualified acceptance of the person being helped, whereas Buber emphasizes a confirmation which, while it accepts the other as a person, may also wrestle <u>with</u> him against himself. In his stress on acceptance, Rogers says that if the therapist is willing for the other person to <u>be what he is</u> -- 'to possess the feelings he possesses, to hold the attitudes he holds' -- it will help him to realize what is 'deepest in the individual, that is the very aspect that can most be trusted to be constructive or to tend toward socialization or toward the development of better inter-personal relationships.'[15]

Buber responded to Rogers in part as follows:

> Confirming means first of all, accepting the whole potentiality of the other and making even a decisive difference in his potentiality . . . I not only accept the other as he is, but I confirm him, in myself, and then in him, in relation to this potentiality that is meant by him and it can now be developed, it can evolve, it can answer the reality of life.[16]

Buber suggested that an individual's existence is a composite of "I-Thou" relationships and "I-It" experiences. While the "I-Thou" relationship is the ideal, Buber recognized that life is not and cannot be continually lived on

the "I-Thou" level. While personhood is fully realized only in the "I-Thou" dialogic relationship, it is inevitable that the "Thou" once objectified becomes an "It," a part of experience, the past, with which one works as a datum of experience. Furthermore, Buber recognized that this objectifying is necessary in order for structure and organization to exist:

> The present is not fugitive and transient, but continually present and enduring. The object is not duration, but cessation, suspension, a breaking off and cutting clear and hardening, absence of relation and of present being. True beings are lived in the present, the life of objects is in the past.[17]

Nonetheless, while the expression of the "I-It" world is necessary, Buber was aware that such expression worked to the basic detriment of man's essential humanity.[18]

Buber illustrated the shift from the "Thou" to "It" with the example of a baby. The child newly born does not so much <u>experience</u> "objects" as he "relates" to everything encountered. A gradual and necessary process occurs as the elements encountered move from a relational aspect to an objectified experience. The woolly stuffed animal becomes not a relation that affirms and confirms the child but an objectified experience which is recognized as other than the child, a part of the ordering experience of the child, namely an "It."[19]

Buber was aware of the dangers accompanying man's inclination toward extremes. His awareness of such dangers derived from his view of man. He recognized man to combine potentiality and confirmation.[20] Man uniquely possesses potentiality, but in order for potentiality to be realized man must "discover his distinctive nature . . . through the confirming presence of another person."[21] Consequently, Buber opposed both individualism and collectivism, for either extreme objectifies and denies relationships.

Individualism focuses exclusively on the "I" while collectivism may ignore or renounce the "I," in either case the possibility of a dialogic "I-Thou" relationship leading possibly to a "collective we" (relational) is lessened if not denied. Only in dialogue may all parties truly be themselves and find themselves affirmed and confirmed in a sense of direct relationship between "I" and "Thou."[22] It is in dialogue, "the attitude of expectant faith,"[23] that the relationship of reciprocity and mutuality is achieved. Buber stated:

> It is not possible to live in the bare present. Life would be quite consumed if precautions were not taken to subdue the present speedily and thoroughly. But it is possible to live in the bare past, indeed only in it may a life be organized. We need only to fill each moment with experiencing and using, and it ceases to burn.
>
> And in all the seriousness of truth, hear this: without It man cannot live. But he who lives with It alone is not a man.[24]

Buber was convinced that the expression of true humanity depended on the presence of authentic dialogic relationship. Schaeder states:

> . . . I-Thou is always lived as elemental unification; and I-It is always a consciousness of something and involves the separation of subject and object. The one creates relation, the other knowledge out of which the world of time and space is structured, the world view of science about which men can communicate with one another. In this world there are contents and objects; the I-Thou relation, however, is nothing but pure Presentness, limitless and incomparable: everything alive lives in its light.[25]

With this brief statement of Buber's philosophical emphases, it is understandable why he has had significant impact upon a number of disciplines. Let us turn now, however, to indicate first, some of the issues raised by faculty development, and second, how Buberian thought might be applied presuppositionally to faculty development.

Faculty Development Issues

Faculty development programs have emerged relatively recently in the world of academe. This phenomenon developed so rapidly that personnel equipped specifically as faculty development specialists were few in number if they existed at all. Nonetheless, the concern arose around real issues: (1) the availability of academically qualified instructors was exceeding academic market demands; (2) institutions recognized that the absence of professional vocational mobility meant that institutional faculties must find vitality from internal renewal; (3) an increasing emphasis upon professorial accountability led to institutional recognition that avenues for professional development should be provided for individuals receiving adverse evaluations; (4) many institutions perceived faculty development as one way of coming to grips with the high percentage of tenured faculty in most departments; and (5) the projections indicating a rather serious decline in student enrollments in the 1980's have led to evaluations of the what, why, and how of teaching as one factor in the continuing struggle to attract sufficient student enrollments to maintain institutional viability.

According to The Chronicle of Higher Education (July 7, 1975, p. 3), almost ten percent, or roughly 200, of the four-year institutions in this country had some type of faculty development project during the 1974-1975 session. Indicative of current and growing interest in this phenomenon, a more recent issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education (November 3, 1975, p. 3) suggests that 400 to 500 institutions now have some form of faculty development program. While these programs fulfill differing objectives, the abundance of the phenomenon, the factors precipitating the emergence of the movement, and the diverse faculty reactions necessarily make faculty development a concern for the academic administrator.

Because faculty development has so recently swept across the academic scene, it would perhaps be helpful to define the phenomenon. Jerry Gaff has defined faculty development as "enhancing the talents, expanding the interests, improving the competence, and otherwise facilitating the professional and personal growth of faculty members, particularly in their roles as instructors."[26] This is a precise and helpful definition. In Gaff's research, three distinct but often interrelated emphases in faculty development programs were revealed: "faculty development, instructional development, and organizational development . . . ."[27] From a differing perspective, Bergquist and Phillips have defined faculty development as "primarily an attempt to improve the quality of the teaching taking place in individual classrooms by focusing on the individual faculty member and the issues that confront him as a teacher, a person, and a member of an organization."[28] While the Bergquist and Phillips' definition may be seen in a larger focus, it should be noted that it does concentrate upon "teaching taking place in individual classrooms . . .." An effective faculty development program must move beyond the confines of the classroom, however, both in terms of the larger questions of institutional and instructional development and in terms of the broader instructional opportunities of the faculty member -- advising, student and personal career development, learning opportunities associated with the dormitories, as well as numerous other instructional possibilities.

An institution seeking to establish a faculty development program must determine the central focus of the program.[29] Such determination notwithstanding, the interrelationship of emphases identified by Gaff or suggested by Bergquist and Phillips is a helpful association to encourage. While central focus should be clear, a program that touches all facets of university life will probably prove to have the most enduring benefits.[30]

As indicated above, however, there are diverse faculty reactions to the establishment of a faculty development program on a campus. Generally speaking, personal experience and most studies indicate these reactions to be more negative than positive.[31] Numerous reasons might be enumerated as to why this is true. Four reasons are discussed below, and, while these are selected primarily from personal experience, my reading indicates that these reasons are broadly expressed and thus each issue must be confronted and answered if the faculty development program is to be successful.

First, traditionally teaching has been understood as a private concern, touching only the specific students involved and the instructor. It has been generally accepted that an instructor adequately trained in his discipline could teach, that one could not be taught to teach. In the academy this view has been encouraged through the programmatic concerns of graduate schools and the disciplinary orientation of most colleges and universities.

More recently, with the emergence of broad-scale interdisciplinary, cross-disciplinary, and multi-disciplinary programs and a new type of student (less inhibited, less threatened by authority), what occurs in the classroom has been increasingly discussed. In most institutions an instructor can no longer rely upon an established research and publication record or an earlier excellence in the classroom. Today's student, nurtured from earliest remembrance on various technological media, demands instructional excellence, incorporating both disciplinary and presentation expertise. Students have frequently insisted that instructors be held accountable for their instruction through evaluation, and some reluctant faculty and administrators have discovered that students will step into the breach and that evaluations often do take place, whether or not institutionally sanctioned!

It is teaching ability rather than disciplinary expertise with which faculty development is primarily concerned. Disciplinary expertise is assumed,[32] but we all recognize that disciplinary expertise does not a teacher make! Faculty development's emphasis upon enhancement of teaching mastery is threatening to the faculty, however, for faculty development seems to presume that the private teaching concern has been either mishandled or inadequately fulfilled. While few professors would assert that a teaching perfection-state has been achieved, it is a totally different issue when I assert this as opposed to my sense that they (administration, peers, students, etc.) are so judging me![33]

Professional pride is a second factor in a faculty's negative reaction to faculty development. While it may be acknowledged that teaching excellence does not characterize the profession in the classroom, faculty members are facile in designating guilty parties preventing their accomplishing such excellence. We usually are victims rather than culprits! We may point to the constraints of time, inadequate financial and/or other teaching resources, incapable students, or numerous other factors. Nonetheless, when faculty development is mentioned, usually the focus falls upon those factors beyond personal control which constrain or prevent an individual's optimal performance.

Education is a unique phenomenon in many ways, and the role of the professor in the institution is of special significance. I find unacceptable, for example, references to "management" of faculty in the sense that this term is usually used in business or industry. Faculty perceive themselves functioning at the "executive" level, creating multiple difficulties in decision making and the execution of operational policy. In a typical

management situation, it is relatively easy for an executive to decree the employee improvement procedures to be utilized. With faculty, however, improvement procedures have characteristically been self-imposed rather than dictated. For the administration, characteristically viewed by faculty as first among equals at best, decreeing improvement procedures and policies is assuring an unsuccessful venture. A faculty development program must begin with the recognition that faculty are not employees. Secondly, any successful program must recognize that the impetus for a faculty development program must derive from and be governed by faculty members. No professional group reacts positively to external intervention in what is judged to be internal affairs.

Third, many disciplinarians are biased against faculty development because it is equated with disciplinary education. The ageless dichotomy between theoretical/abstract and practical/concrete education is continually raised.[34]

Disciplinarians fear that faculty development implies pouring everyone into a single methodological mold, regardless of subject matter, course goals, or disciplinary uniqueness. A type of unspoken assumption prevails that the emphasis will be placed upon keeping proper records and developing cohesive lesson plans, and the end result being that master teachers are developed! Nothing could be further from truth, but nonetheless such assumptions, verbalized or not, must be confronted and dismissed.

Even beyond disciplinary education, the current direction of higher education has intensified this concern. The emergence of community colleges, with a major emphasis toward vocational/practical education, has caused some consternation among college and university faculties as the liberal arts appear to be suffering erosion. On the one hand, faculty react negatively

because they envision faculty development as one tool which potentially intensifies this erosion. On the other hand, academic chauvinism asserts itself, for it is recognized that numerically community colleges have led in the emergence of faculty development programs (see The Chronicle of Higher Education, November 3, 1975, p. 3).

This suggests a fourth negative reaction voiced by faculty members when confronted by a faculty development program, namely the fear of depersonalization. Faculty fear that the development monster will make all men in its own image! The end result of this scenario would be that, apart from words indicative of discipline, Professor X would not be distinguishable from Professor Y in teaching methodology, testing, and student involvement. In this sense depersonalization means that the distinctive characteristics of each individual would be effectively removed.

The bases for faculty reticence to accept faculty development programs could be chronicled ad infinatum. That notwithstanding, academic administrators must reckon with faculty development and the issues which have called it forth. These issues -- as the academic market place, steady-state or declining enrollments, and tenure questions -- are likely to assume even greater significance in the next decade. While faculty may approach faculty development with questions, reserve, and even trepidation, the institution does a grave disservice to the faculty when it ignores its faculty development responsibility. Alongside financial expertise, faculty development may be the most important issue in higher education in the 1980's.

The problem for the academic administrator is achieving a productive union of faculty development concerns and faculty members so that both the faculty and the institution mutually benefit. Put another way, faculty

development must encompass a program faculty members respect, recognize as a tool enabling them to do a more effective job, and encourage their colleagues to share. The question is how to achieve these goals. To be successful, the administrator must give attention to the conceptual bases underlying a program of faculty development. In the quest for these conceptual bases we find Martin Buber's contribution helpful.

Buberian Responses to Faculty Development Issues

Four selected faculty development problem areas have been presented, not because these summarize all issues confronted but because from personal experience they appear to encapsulate some of the problems arising with greatest frequency. Likewise, one does not apply Buber's thought to faculty development issues because Buber spoke directly to the issues. As currently defined, faculty development was non-existent during Buber's life. Nonetheless, Buber's writings focus primarily upon interpersonal relationships. It seems not at all inappropriate, therefore, to formulate the three principles discussed hereafter, for while Buber did not address faculty development, Buberian thought is assuredly applicable. In these three principles, there are basic commitments which have Buberian foundation and which must undergird a faculty development program if it is to encourage and assist the individual toward optimal personal and professional realization.

First, a program of faculty development must affirm the individual as a person and confirm his self-esteem. The program, therefore, must be non-threatening, for faculty will react negatively if the program is associated with the formulation of potentially punitive judgments.[35] The program must affirm and confirm rather than hold the individual against a rigid standard of uniform judgment.

It has been indicated earlier that many faculty react negatively to faculty development programs because they fear depersonalization. Buberian analysis asserts that a program focused on affirmation of persons and confirmation of self-esteem will not fall victim to this charge. An effective faculty development program removes the fear of depersonalization because the focus is on an authentic "I-Thou" relationship which takes with ultimate seriousness "Here and Now" presentness and the reality of man's potentiality. In Buberian terms, self-consciousness is eliminated. While Buber is assuredly correct that we cannot live continually at the "I-Thou" level, and indeed we should not, the absence of self-consciousness constitutes a faculty awareness that the program exists to do something <u>for him</u> rather than <u>to him</u>.

The program must focus on the strengths of the individual. Each instructor has specific strengths and weaknesses. These strengths may reside in organizational ability, communication expertise, interpersonal relations, force of personality, or numerous other attributes. It is imperative that a faculty development program emphasize these strengths in order that the individual, while seeking to overcome weaknesses, might build from strength.

As a program to affirm personhood and to confirm self-esteem, a faculty development program must be person centered. While this is an easy statement to make, it should make a significant difference both in the nature of the program developed and the faculty's reaction to same. A program may be hardware centered, technologically oriented, goal/objective focused, methodologically centered, or any number of other foci which cause the true center of concern -- the individual instructor -- to assume secondary status. An effective program will recognize the individuality of the person -- strengths and weaknesses, background, aspirations -- within the context of the larger

focus of the institution. Effort will be expended to assist that individual's optimal development of potential, recognizing that every person is unique.

At the same time, one of the most effective services offered by a faculty development program might be that of assisting the individual to assess his/her capabilities and aspirations in terms of an institution's mission. For example, if an individual is an able researcher but ineffective as a classroom teacher and is associated with an institution which has characteristically perceived its primary mission as teaching, then the program should help the individual to recognize that either personal capabilities and aspirations must be brought into clearer focus with the institution's mission or the individual will likely find neither satisfaction nor security in the institution. A faculty development program which functions effectively, therefore, serves the dual purpose both of enhancing the faculty member's performance and of assisting personal fulfillment.

We conclude, therefore, that an effective faculty development program must affirm the individual's uniqueness and must serve to confirm the individual's self-esteem. Anything less than this is not only demeaning to the individual, it is also destructive to the institution's ultimate mission.

Second, a program of faculty development must be dialogic by nature. The emphasis upon dialogue was basic to Buber's relational philosophy. As indicated earlier, Streiker characterizes dialogue for Buber as "the attitude of expectant faith" in which the relationship of reciprocity and mutuality is achieved.[36] Reciprocity and mutuality are two marks which must be present in a faculty development program if a faculty member is to feel comfortable participating in the program. All facets of the institution's internal life, including faculty, students, and administrators, must be dialogically engaged if openness is to be enjoyed.

Dialogue must be encouraged. The proper atmosphere must be nurtured. In The Promise of Buber, Streiker addressed the meaning of religious sensitivity and responsibility for Buber. Streiker's words are appropriate for the individual seeking to determine how aggressively such an atmosphere should be sought:

> But if the welfare of my neighbor is my responsibility, how can I possibly know of what my neighbor's good consists? Am I at the mercy of my feelings and instincts? Am I not as likely to meddle as to assist, to interfere as to confirm? It must be admitted that I can never be certain that my action is in the best interest of another. But at least I act. I-You sensitivity predisposes me to act and forbids my indifference. It does not give me general rules or maxims to govern my response.[37]

No faculty development program operates with the assurance that every action will convey the greatest possible benefits, either for the specific individual or for the collective faculty. Nonetheless, recognizing that mistakes will occur, the program functions out of a caring, sharing concern which seeks in that "attitude of expectant faith" the welfare of the other.

It may be that in many contexts faculty disciplinary allegiances tend to discourage personal openness. We are extremely uncomfortable when encouraged to move from the discipline to the process by which that discipline is communicated to the student. We can learn from our colleagues, but we must first be willing to open ourselves to them in a relationship of reciprocity and mutuality.

Refusal to open ourselves to others is particularly harmful to the student's welfare. Students sometimes complain that "it does no good to talk to Professor X" or "Professor Y treats me like an object." These complaints are too often justified. While grading must be done in a detached, objective fashion, frequently we retreat behind this "I-It" facade and never achieve the "I-Thou" where the student is met openly. We refuse to know our students through authentic openness which comes from communication and which

encourages an "I-Thou" relationship -- a relational dialogic openness which lives in the present rather than the objectified past.

Faculty and students must be joined by the administration in this quest for dialogue. An administrative danger is isolation from other community participants. While an administrator cannot legislate an "I-Thou" relationship with either faculty or students, he can structure stiuations wherein openness is encouraged. Certainly, the administrator can avoid the continued enforcement of "I-It" experiences.

In many situations an active faculty development program is difficult to establish because of an "us-them" attitude toward administrators, an attitude which frequently the administrator encourages either implicitly or explicitly. Faculty recognize that an administrator ofen has infrequent association with students, often limited to contacts either with campus leaders or with those experiencing difficulty. Since the institution exists for education, however, and since the students are the ultimate focus of that process, administrators cannot permit this situation to exist. While relationships cannot be created, openness can be fostered. Unfortunately, where the administration is perceived to discourage such openness, an institution frequently assumes this aura throughout. Where such absence of openness is characteristic, an effective faculty development program cannot exist.

Some administrators, desiring to hasten the establishment of a faculty development program, have initiated programs by administrative fiat in order to circumvent the approximately eighteen months separating idea conception and enactment in most institutions. At worst, faculty members may be manipulated to assist in setting up programs. At best, faculty will continually search for the administration's hidden agenda and will participate reluctantly,

frequently acting out of a sense of coercion. Regardless, dialogue precludes an administratively imposed faculty development program.

Finally, to encourage dialogue the faculty development program must be a dynamic program seeking to respond to the changing needs of the faculty. A static program offering the same opportunities each year does not take seriously the faculty with its potential, needs, and aspirations. The dynamic qualities necessary for an effective faculty development program can exist only in an institution characterized by dialogic openness.

Third, a faculty development program must represent the institution's encompassing commitment to individual fulfillment. Buber's philosophical emphases mirrored significantly the tragic conversation with the student earlier mentioned. The basic recognition derived from this conversation was that my "I" must find personal satisfaction in the fulfillment of the "Thou" encountered. Translated into institutional terms, the institution cannot take primacy. Specifically, an educational institution equals people; it exists to serve people. Regardless of other functions which may accrue to the university -- research, publication, consulting -- it is primarily a person-oriented institution.

An effective faculty development program expresses this orientation throughout an individual's career, but specifically this focus begins with employment practices. In the current academic market, institutions are tempted to secure faculty for the minimal expenditure. Given the financial problems confronting higher education, this is an understandable if regrettable temptation. Such employment practices are not only demeaning to the faculty member, however, they also detrimentally effect the students and ultimately the institution's reputation.

A faculty development program may be one safeguard against such employment attitudes. For example, special opportunities may be provided for instructors recently brought into the institution. Recently graduated instructors, themselves baccalaureate recipients of the turbulent sixties, frequently have vocational aspirations quite different from many older faculty. Young instructors frequently demonstrate an intense social consciousness, and they are vitally concerned that their teaching respond to current social issues. An institution should exploit this source of teaching concern, albeit recognizing that most graduate schools have done little to assist the individual to understand teaching as a profession.[38]

Regardless of the faculty development opportunities utilized, the emphases must affirm the worth of the individual instructor and the value of the teaching task. In an institution where these emphases are present, new instructors will not be treated as chattel.

A faculty development program must serve the entire faculty,[39] the large group of middle-career and new faculty as well as those approaching retirement. A faculty member, regardless of career placement, should find program offerings which encourage and assist personal fulfillment. A Buberian approach to faculty development demands this, for selection of one element as focus of the program isolates and particularizes that group. Especially if the program assume remedial overtones, this inevitably places the individual on the defensive and creates thereby a situation destined to be minimally productive.

Faculty development should encourage the recognition that each individual contributes to the fulfillment of the other. The ultimate relational goal is the "collective we." No individual reaches the state where the "Thou"

encountered is unimportant or where the "I-Thou" relationship is no longer desirable or beneficial. Faculty development must represent the institution's encompassing commitment to the ongoing relational process as each individual moves toward optimal personal fulfillment.

Conclusion

Martin Buber's thought is influential in many disciplines; it is also helpful when applied to faculty development. He is particularly important for faculty development because of his insistence upon the primacy of the individual while always looking to the "other." We can never hide behind the facade of our private concerns -- teaching as a private domain, professional pride, prejudices regarding disciplinary education, or fears of depersonalization -- if Buberian themes undergird our directing principles. Buber helps us to recognize that teaching and personal fulfillment build upon relationships rather than upon abstract, objectified experiences.

This rational focus would enhance any program of faculty development. Only in such a relational situation does true dialogue occur, opening individuals to the possibility of an authentic "I-Thou" relationship. Buber stands to remind us that a program of faculty development must affirm the individual as a person and confirm his self-esteem, must be dialogic by nature, and must represent the institution's encompassing commitment to individual fulfillment. If these principles undergird a program of faculty development, then a program will exist which faculty members respect, recognize as a tool enabling them to do a more effective job, and encourage their colleagues to share.

Notes

1. One of the best sources for understanding the how is A Handbook for Faculty Development by William H. Bergquist and Steven R. Phillips with G. Quehl as General Editor (Washington, D.C.: The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975).
2. Richard D. Mann, et al, The College Classroom: Conflict, Change, and Learning (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970), p. v.
3. Bibliographies of writings by and about Martin Buber may be found in The Philosophy of Martin Buber, ed. by Paul Arthur Schilpp and Maurice Friedman, in "The Library of Living Philosophers," Vol. 12, ed. by Paul Arthur Schilpp (La Salle, Illinois: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1967), pp. 747-786; Aubrey Hodes, Martin Buber: An Intimate Portrait (New York: The Viking Press, 1971), pp. 235-237; and Lowell D. Streiker, The Promise of Buber, in "The Promise of Theology," ed. by Martin E. Marty (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1969), pp. 91-92.
4. In addition to the volumes mentioned in note 3, Grete Schaeder's The Hebrew Humanism of Martin Buber, trans. by Noah J. Jacobs (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1973), is also helpful for understanding Buber.
5. Streiker, The Promise of Buber, p. 20.
6. Martin Buber, The Knowledge of Man, ed. with Introduction by Maurice Friedman, trans. by Maurice Friedman and Ronald Gregor Smith (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965), p. 13.
7. Appeared in German edition in 1923 as Ich und Du, with first English translation in 1937. See the second edition as translated by Ronald Gregor Smith and published by Charles Schribner's Sons, 1958.

8. Schilpp and Friedman, The Philosophy of Martin Buber, p. 26.
9. Schaeder, The Hebrew Humanism of Martin Buber, pp. 145-146. See also Martin Buber, Between Man and Man, trans. by Ronald Gregor Smith (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, & Co., Ltd., 1947), pp. 11-12.
10. See Schaeder, The Hebrew Humanism of Martin Buber, pp. 146 and 148.
11. Buber, Between Man and Man, pp. 77-78.
12. Schaeder, The Hebrew Humanism of Martin Buber, p. 145.
13. See Buber, I and Thou, second edition, p. 6.
14. See "Genuine Dialogue and the Possibilities of Peace," in Pointing the Way, Collected Essays (1957), p. 238. Quotation utilized in R. G. Smith, Martin Buber, "Makers of Contemporary Theology" (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1967), p. 8.
15. Buber, The Knowledge of Man, p. 29.
16. Buber, The Knowledge of Man, p. 182.
17. Buber, I and Thou, second edition, p. 13.
18. Schaeder, The Hebrew Humanism of Martin Buber, p. 154.
19. Buber, I and Thou, second edition, pp. 25-28.
20. Streiker, The Promise of Buber, pp. 39-40, treats this effectively.
21. Streiker, The Promise of Buber, p. 40.
22. See Buber, Between Man and Man, pp. 1-39.
23. Streiker, The Promise of Buber, p. 35.
24. Buber, I and Thou, second edition, p. 34.
25. Schaeder, The Hebrew Humanism of Martin Buber, p. 151.
26. Jerry G. Gaff, Toward Faculty Renewal, "The Jossey-Bass Series in Higher Education" (Washington: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975), p. 14.
27. See Gaff, Toward Faculty Renewal, p. 8. See pp. 8-11 for brief discussion.

28. Bergquist and Phillips, A Handbook for Faculty Development, pp. vii-viii.

29. Besides Gaff's very able study, one would find helpful Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment by The Group for Human Development in Higher Education (1974; available through Change Magazine); Mervin Freedman, ed., "Facilitating Faculty Development," New Directions for Higher Education (Washington: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973); and Bergquist and Phillips, A Handbook for Faculty Development.

30. This conclusion is supported by Gaff, Toward Faculty Renewal, pp. 12-13, 95ff., and 174. It is also supported by Bergquist and Phillips, A Handbook for Faculty Development, pp. 5-6, where it is emphasized that a faculty development program must effect significant changes "at the three levels of attitude, process, and structure."

31. See discussion by Gaff, Toward Faculty Renewal, pp. 120-122.

32. Exceptions to this assumption regarding disciplinary expertise would be situations such as a faculty development program facilitating the retraining of persons currently in disciplines experiencing severe retrenchment or where faculty members' training might be enriched for participation in new programs, such as interdisciplinary teaching.

33. Discussing student evaluation, Bergquist and Phillips, A Handbook for Faculty Development, assert that "One of the paradoxes inherent in change is that both people and institutions are least likely to change when someone tells them that they should change" (p. 47).

34. See Gaff, Toward Faculty Renewal, p. 118, for appropriate discussion.

35. Grace French-Lazovik, in "Evaluation of College Teaching: Guidelines for Summative and Formative Procedures," an occasional paper of the Association of American Colleges (1976), has helpfully discussed the distinction between summative evaluation for tenure and promotion and

formative evaluation for improvement. Formative evaluation could be used constructively by a faculty development program.

36. Streiker, The Promise of Buber, p. 35.

37. Streiker, The Promise of Buber, p. 59.

38. See Gaff, Toward Faculty Renewal, pp. 3 and 16.

39. See Gaff, Toward Faculty Renewal, pp. 18-27, for a good discussion of the developmental process and needs of adults as related to faculty development. Also, Kenneth E. Eble, Career Development of the Effective College Teacher (Washington: Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors, 1971), pp. 36-82, discusses helpfully the unique situations associated with professors at differing career points chronologically.